



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,741	05/01/2001	Jai Rawat	CA1095	4472

23493 7590 10/20/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
401 Castro Street, Ste 220
Mountain View, CA 94041-2007

EXAMINER

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/846,741	Applicant(s) RAWAT ET AL.	
	Examiner Kristie Shingles	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-18, 23-29, 34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-18, 23-29, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 23-29, 34 and 35 are pending.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 23-26 have been amended.

Claims 11, 19-22 and 30-33 have been cancelled.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 12 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 23, 26, 27, 29, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schultz et al* (US Publication 2001/0029484).

a. Per claim 1, *Schultz et al* teach a system for capturing electronic receipts from electronic mail messages comprising:

- a first computer server configured for receiving a plurality of electronic mail messages and for parsing said electronic mail messages to identify a subset thereof which comprise commercial correspondence having commercial data related to a commercial transaction (pages 2-3 paragraphs 0034, 0037-0038 and 0040; page 5 paragraph 0048; page 6 paragraph 0056; page 7 paragraph 0066—identifying receipts and subset of commercial data with receipts in order to organize the receipts based on user category, usable in email systems); and
- program code residing on said first computer server for creating receipt data by extracting said commercial data from said subset of electronic mail messages which comprise commercial correspondence (page 6 paragraphs 0056 and 0065; page 7 paragraphs 0066, 0067 and 0069; storing and creating categorized receipt listings based on user-defined categories for the extracted commercial data of the receipts).

Although *Shultz et al* fail to explicitly teach receiving a plurality of electronic mail messages and parsing the electronic mail messages to identify commercial correspondence, *Shultz et al* do explicitly suggest implementation of the electronic transaction receipts system within email systems (pages 2-3 paragraph 0034). Delivering electronic/digital receipts using emails and filtering emails based on user-defined policy are both well-known concepts in the art, for which *Shultz et al* teach and suggests email systems having such features to enable the categorization of receipt email messages based on the receipt data within the message.

b. **Claims 6, 12 and 23** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 2**, *Shultz et al* teach the system of Claim 1, wherein said first computer server permits display of receipt data (page 7 paragraphs 0066-0071).

d. **Claim 13** is substantially similar to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

e. **Per claim 9**, *Shultz et al* teach the method of Claim 6, wherein said step of extracting further comprises the steps of: querying a database of template data; and comparing

Art Unit: 2141

each of subset of said electronic mail messages with said template data obtained from said step of querying (page 2-3 paragraphs 0034 and 0037; page 7 paragraphs 0066-0069).

f. **Claim 26** is substantially similar to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

g. **Per claim 10**, *Shultz et al* teach the method of Claim 6, further comprising the steps of providing a database for storing receipt data; and storing identified commercial data as receipt data in said database (page 7 paragraph 0071, pages 3-4 paragraphs 0037 and 0040).

h. **Per claim 18**, *Shultz et al* teach the system of Claim 12, wherein said electronic mail messages contains data content related to an electronic receipt (page 2 paragraph 0031; page 3 paragraphs 0034 and 0037; page 5 paragraphs 0047-0048).

i. **Per claim 27**, *Shultz et al* teach the method of Claim 23, further comprising: providing an additional database for storing said data content; and storing said data content in said additional database in accordance with user configurable preferences contained in said data records (page 7 paragraphs 0070-0072).

j. **Per claim 29**, *Shultz et al* teach the method of Claim 23, wherein said step of examining comprises the step of: extracting data related to an electronic receipt (page 5 paragraph 0049; page 6 paragraphs 0056 and 0065; page 7 paragraphs 0066-0067, 0069 and 0071).

k. **Per claim 34**, *Shultz et al* teach the system of Claim 12, wherein said central database is encrypted (pages 2-3 paragraphs 0034-0035, 0037).

l. **Claim 35** is substantially similar to claim 34 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

2. Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 14-17, 24, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schultz et al* (US Publication 2001/0029484) in view of *Julien* (USPN 6,694,307).

a. **Per claim 3**, *Schultz et al* teach the systems and methods of Claims 1, 6, 12 and 23 as applied above. *Schultz et al* teach the system of Claim 1 comprising a database at said first computer server (page 3 paragraphs 0037 and 0039-0040; page 7 paragraph 0071), yet fail to further explicitly teach the system of Claim 1, wherein said first computer server permits alteration of header data of said electronic correspondence in accordance with data records stored in said database. However, *Julien* discloses a system allowing a server to access a database and furthermore permits alteration and updates of electronic correspondence header data, which primarily includes address data—i.e. email addresses, fax numbers, etc (col.3 lines 1-62, col.7 lines 20-29, col.9 line 65-col.11 line 17 and col.11 line 21-col.12 line 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Schultz et al* with *Julien* in order to allow for alteration of header data in electronic correspondence for the purpose of keeping information up-to-date and keeping the database current.

b. **Claims 7, 8, 14, 17, 24, 25 and 28** contain limitations substantially similar to Claim 3 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 4**, *Schultz et al* and *Julien* teach the system of Claim 3, *Schultz et al* further teach the system wherein said program code comprises: instructions for storing said

receipt data in said database (page 3 paragraphs 0037 and 0039-0040; pages 6-7 paragraphs 0065-0072).

d. **Per claim 5**, *Schultz et al* teach the system of Claim 4, wherein said first computer server permits extraction of said receipt data from said database (page 5 paragraph 0049, page 6 paragraphs 0056 and 0065; page 7 paragraphs 0066-0067, 0069 and 0071-0072).

e. **Claim 15** is substantially similar to claims 4 and 10 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

f. **Claim 16** is substantially equivalent to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Bowman et al (6,460,163), Venkatraman et al (6,477,647), Anderson (6,442,600), McGurl et al (6,223,168), Angotti et al (6,182,059), Ogasawara (7,050,991).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2141


CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Art Unit 2141


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER